

# EXHIBIT

12

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

MARC VEASEY, ET AL.,	)	CASE NO: 2:13-CV-00193
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	CIVIL
	)	
vs.	)	Corpus Christi, Texas
	)	
RICK PERRY, ET AL.,	)	Friday, August 12, 2016
	)	
Defendants.	)	(2:31 p.m. to 3:05 p .m.)

---

TELEPHONIC STATUS CONFERENCE

BEFORE THE HONORABLE NELVA GONZALES RAMOS,  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Appearances: See Next Page

Court Recorder: Frenchie Carbia

Case Manager: Genay Rogan

Deputy U.S. Marshals: H. Word; S. Osteicher

Transcriber: Exceptional Reporting Services, Inc.  
P.O. Box 18668  
Corpus Christi, TX 78480-8668  
361 949-2988

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording;  
transcript produced by transcription service.

1 once a television ad or radio had as been aired, it cannot be  
2 unaired. People that have heard it are going to absorb it, and  
3 whatever information they have that is inaccurate or is  
4 misleading is something that they're going to carry with them  
5 when they go into the polls or do something -- not show up.

6 We certainly do not want this process to be  
7 inefficient. Again, we are limiting our ads precisely because  
8 we would like to move on and have the education and training  
9 happen.

10 Would -- perhaps the State would be willing to submit  
11 the text to the Court to ensure that it has the appropriate  
12 level of accuracy and it's going to do the job that it's  
13 supposed to do, which is adequately inform people about the  
14 changes and the Interim Remedy.

15 **THE COURT:** It sounds like, though, from what  
16 Ms. Colmenero said these are, kind of, changing as they're  
17 going along and as they're being created and produced, I guess,  
18 which appears to be what the problem is.

19 Ms. Colmenero, do you want to expand on that?

20 **MS. COLMENERO:** That is exactly correct, your Honor.  
21 When we get into the production process, we have to retain  
22 flexibility to make modifications to the text, if necessary.  
23 And we really just don't want to find ourselves in a position  
24 where we had to make a change because a director of a  
25 commercial said that a certain scene shot wouldn't work, and

1 the Plaintiffs raise this as an issue that wasn't run by them.  
2 And that is -- that's part of why this is just a very difficult  
3 ads on our end.

4                   And second, because the creative concepts that were  
5 initially provided to the State from our vendor, they haven't  
6 been updated in the 48 hours since this Court has issued its  
7 Interim Remedy Order. And we're working as fast and furious as  
8 we can to purchase media spots in the -- across the state so we  
9 can start airing these, but also, to kind of get these to  
10 production as quickly as we can.

11                  **THE COURT:** Anything else on that issue?

12                  **MR. DELLHEIM:** Your Honor, this is Richard Dellheim  
13 for the United States. And speaking only for the United  
14 States, at the end of the day we think it's the State's  
15 responsibility, of course, to ensure compliance with -- with  
16 Section 2 and completely remedy the discriminatory effects of  
17 SB14.

18                  And while we, of course, think it would be helpful  
19 for the State to agree to share more fully its remedial plans  
20 with us to avoid problems down the road, to the extent it  
21 declines to do that with respect to the text that it's  
22 advertising, we are not -- we are prepared at this time not to  
23 seek relief from the Court.

24                  I guess it's our preferred route to defer to the  
25 State in this instance and wait and see what it does. And we

1 would, of course, reserve the right to address any substantial  
2 shortcomings at an appropriate time, first, of course, with the  
3 State, and then only if necessary, with the Court.

4           **THE COURT:** All right. Then the Court's going to  
5 deny that request from the Plaintiffs regarding the text of the  
6 commercials.

7           What else to address?

8           **MS. COLMENERO:** I think there was one final request  
9 from the Plaintiffs, and that was regarding the introduction of  
10 a -- I'll call it a "dispute resolution process" to resolve  
11 issues in the future.

12           I think that the Court's prior order, obviously, puts  
13 a burden on the State to create an implementation plan, provide  
14 it to the Court on August the 15th, as well as move forward and  
15 execute one. And that's what we're working as quickly as we  
16 can on our end to accomplish.

17           And so, we believe that the Plaintiffs have  
18 traditional remedies that are already available to them and  
19 there does not need to be a formalization of a dispute  
20 resolution process to move forward or put forth in any kind of  
21 separate order.

22           **MS. PEREZ:** May I qualify, your Honor? This is  
23 Ms. Perez.

24           **THE COURT:** Yes.

25           **MS. PEREZ:** We are in this position where we're